DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 501 CG 024 719

AUTHOR Horan, John J.; And Others
TITLE Manifestations of the MOMM Phenomenon II: Relevant Data on Professional Darwinism and Membership Composition.
PUB DATE Aug 91
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (99th, San Francisco, CA, August 16-20, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counseling; Editors; *Productivity; *Professional Associations; *Psychologists; Scholarly Journals; Writing for Publication
IDENTIFIERS *American Psychological Association; *MOMM Cartel

ABSTRACT

Horan (1989) reported that graduates and employees of four institutions (Minnesota, Ohio State, Maryland, and Missouri - the "MOMM Cartel") heavily dominate every science and practice organ of the American Psychological Association's Division 17 governing body. Goldman (1990) provided additional data indicating that egregious exclusion of outsiders is characteristic of all Division 17 appointments over the past 5 years. A frequent response to these findings attributes the predominance of graduates and employees from MOMM institutions in all Division 17 governance structures to a sort of "professional Darwinism" (greater achievement by individuals affiliated with MOMM institutions). Others argue that given alternative baselines, MOMMs might prove to be underrepresented. Two studies were conducted to address this debate. The first investigated the professional-Darwinism hypothesis by examining the productivity of appointees to the editorial boards of Division 17's journals. The second study examined the charge of non-representativeness by analyzing Division 17's membership composition at two points in time. Data on the scholarly productivity of MOMMs and outsiders, at the time of their appointment to the editorial boards, suggest that outsiders are more productive than MOMMs, and that there is a significant disposition to appoint relatively unpublished MOMMs to the "Journal of Counseling Psychology" editorial board. Data further indicated that outsiders were indeed underrepresented; data revealed an unexpected and conspicuous decline in their membership percentage between 1973 and 1989. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353501

Manifestations of the MOMM Phenomenon II: Relevant Data on Professional Darwinism and Membership Composition

John J. Horan

Peggy Fitzsimmons

Wanda L. Weber

Chris Maglio

Chris D. Erickson

Division of Psychology in Education

Arizona State University

Running Head: MOMM PHENOMENON II

Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1991

8/12/91

CG024719

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

A frequent response to papers by Horan (1989) and Goldman (1990) attributes the predominance of graduates and employees from MOMM institutions in all Division 17 governance structures to professional Darwinism, that is, greater achievement by individuals affiliated with MOMM institutions. Others argue that given alternative baselines, MOMMs might prove to be under-represented. Our data on the scholarly productivity of MOMMs and OUTSIDERs, at the time of their appointment to the editorial boards of JCP and TCP, suggest that OUTSIDERs are more productive than MOMMs, and that there is a significant disposition to appoint relatively unpublished MOMMs to JCP's editorial board. Our data further indicate that OUTSIDERs are indeed under-represented; moreover, an unexpected and conspicuous decline in their membership percentage between 1973 and 1989 is an ominous indicator of Division 17's organizational health.

Manifestations of the MOMM Phenomenon II: Relevant Data on Professional Darwinism and Membership Composition

Horan (1989) reported that graduates and employees of four institutions (Minnesota, Ohio State, Maryland, and Missouri -- the "MOMM Cartel") heavily dominate every science and practice organ of Division 17's governing body. All current and previous editors and associate editors of the Journal of Counseling Psychology and 54% of its 1989 editorial board, for example, are graduates and/or employees of these institutions. Goldman (1990) conducted similar analyses and provided additional data indicating that egregious exclusion of OUTSIDERs is characteristic of all Division 17 appointments over the past five years.

Both papers have spawned considerable debate and controversy. Some argue that MOMM predominance is an inevitable consequence of the fact that these purportedly stronger programs attract and graduate more competent scientist-practitioners who rise to positions of leadership via a sort of "professional Darwinism." Horan and Erickson's (1990) analysis of fellow elections in Division 17, however, yielded data at odds with the Darwinian presumption of greater achievement by MOMM graduates and employees in comparison to those from OUTSIDER institutions. They reported that: a) No MOMM nominee was rejected; b) the accepted OUTSIDERs were significantly more productive than the MOMMs; c) two of the four rejected OUTSIDERs ranked numbers one

and two in scholarly productivity among all nominees; d) no relationship appeared between scholarship and fellow decisions; and e) MOMM membership strongly predicted election to fellow status (r = .62). Although Horan and Erickson's (1990) data are quite compelling, the non-public nature of rejection decisions limited the investigation to the first two years of Horan's service on the Fellowship Committee; as such, these data do not preclude the professional Darwinism hypothesis from explaining other Division 17 appointments or indeed fellowship elections in previous years.

The charge of non-representativeness leveled by Horan (1989) and Goldman (1990), of course, presumes that graduates and employees of MOMM institutions constitute a relatively small minority of Division 17's membership, as suggested by Horan's (1989) observation that MOMM institutions comprise four from a list of 64 on the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP) roster. But Krumboltz (1990) has argued for the possibility of alternative baselines; for example, if MOMM graduates amount to 70% of Division 17's membership, then their 54% participation on JCP's editorial board is really a case of under-representation.

This paper presents additional data bearing on the foregoing questions. Study I addresses the professional-Darwinism hypothesis by examining the productivity of appointees to the editorial boards of Division 17's journals. Study II sheds light

on the charge of non-representativeness by analyzing Division 17's membership composition at two points in time.

STUDY I

In this study we compared the scholarly productivity of MOMMs and OUTSIDERs at the time of their appointments to the editorial boards of the Journal of Counseling Psychology and The Counseling Psychologist. The professional-Darwinism hypothesis would be supported by data indicating greater productivity on the part of MOMMs. It would be soundly refuted, however, if the OUTSIDERs displayed superior scholarly achievement at the time of their appointments. The latter finding would bolster the premise that the sociology-of-science principles invoked by Horan and Erickson (1990) in their analysis of Division 17's fellowship behavior, account for Division 17 editorial board appointments as well.

Method

Subjects

New appointees to the editorial boards of JCP and TCP were identified by comparing journal mastheads from a given year with those of the previous year. The span of our investigation began with volume 29 (1982) of JCP and volume 13 (1985) of TCP and continued each year thereafter.

Measure

Scholarly productivity was defined in terms of the total number of publications produced by a given appointee that are contained in the PsycLIT data base up to and including the year

in which the appointment occurred. PsycLIT includes all Psychological Abstracts citations for the years 1974 to 1990 in an easily searched CD-ROM format. We reasoned that any publication in the years after the appointment occurred would be irrelevant to the appointment decision; however, those that were published in the year of the appointment would likely have been reviewed by some individuals involved in the selection process.

Procedures

New board members were designated as either MOMMs or OUTSIDERs from educational and employment histories contained in the 1989 APA membership directory. MOMMs were those individuals found to be either graduates or employees (prior to the time of their editorial board appointment) of the four institutions in question; all others were labeled as OUTSIDERs.

Pedigrees and PsycLIT counts were determined by pairs of doctoral students in counseling psychology working independently. Minor discrepancies (e.g., due to similar names in the literature) were fully resolved by closer inspection, thus yielding optimal inter-rater reliability and validity.

Results

Table I summarizes the scholarly productivity of MOMM and OUTSIDER appointees to the Journal of Counseling Psychology over the past decade. These data are not amenable to collapsing across the year variable; doing so would attenuate the scholarly records of those appointed in earlier years because the PsycLIT

data-base begins in 1974. We chose not to use a derived score (such as dividing the PsycLIT count by the number of years in the interval between their appointment and 1974 or the year of their graduation, whichever is later), because the simple raw data are so easily understood.

Insert Table 1 about here.

To illustrate, in the first year of our inquiry (1982) there were 24 new appointees to JCP's editorial board. Of these, 15 were MOMMs and 9 were OUTSIDERs; the MOMMs had previously published an average of 12.6 articles, the OUTSIDERs 20.0. The OUTSIDERs, heavily outnumbered by the MOMMs, were significantly more productive [t (22) = 1.99, p = .03].

The large number of appointees in 1982 accompanied the beginning of a new editor's term of office. In the remaining five years of that term, seven MOMMs and five OUTSIDERs were added to the editorial board. The sizes of these ns are too small to permit yearly statistical comparisons; however, visual inspection of the raw scores in each year of that term reveals that the OUTSIDERs are generally more productive, except in 1987 when a solitary well-published MOMM was added to the board.

Coincident with the beginning of a new editor's term in 1988, eight MOMMs and three OUTSIDERs were appointed to the board. No OUTSIDERs were appointed in the year before, and only one was

added after that time, so there is little basis for yearly comparisons. It is clear that OUTSIDERs are even more under-represented in this era and that the overall productivity of the MOMMs is highly variable.

Appointments to editorial boards are customarily reserved for those individuals whose manuscripts have repeatedly survived peer scrutiny. It might be argued that except in unusual circumstances the act of appointing relatively unpublished individuals to editorial boards derives from sociology-of-science principles other than merit. Thus, the variability of the MOMM publication distribution warranted closer inspection. Recall that the PsycLIT span begins in 1974. We noted that a score of nine would represent an average of at least one publication per year for the 1982 appointees (the cohort most affected by the attenuated data base). We thus designated all individuals having less than a total of nine publications as "relatively unpublished" regardless of their average in any brief series of years. Only one of the 18 OUTSIDERs appointed to JCP's editorial board between 1982 and 1991 had fewer than nine publications in the PsycLIT database; yet of the 34 MOMM appointees in this interval, nine individuals had eight or fewer publications. Indeed, five of these nine had only three or four publications. This pattern of appointing relatively unpublished MOMMs is not within the confines of statistical likelihood; a Fisher Exact Test on the factors of pedigree (MOMM/OUTSIDER) and propriety

(fewer-than-nine vs nine-or-more publications) revealed a $p = .05$ indicating a systematic disposition to appoint lowly published MOMMs to JCP's editorial board.

These data clearly dispel any notion of greater scholarly productivity, and thus deservedness, on the part of MOMM appointees. The question of non-representativeness, though seemingly self-evident, awaited consideration of additional membership data to be established in Study II. But first, a look at the data for The Counseling Psychologist.

The results of our analysis of the productivity of MOMMs and OUTSIDERs appointed to the editorial board of TCP also stand in opposition to the professional Darwinism hypothesis, albeit less dramatically. A new editor took charge in 1984, and the pattern of appointments beginning in 1985 and ending 1989 differed from that of JCP. In the first place, OUTSIDERs were no longer vastly outnumbered by MOMMs, and in fact held the edge (ns = 11 and 8, respectively). Moreover, a maximum of four of each were added in any one year, and the mix of pedigrees was reasonably equivalent over the course of time. Because of these distribution characteristics, and the fact that only four appointees received their doctoral degrees prior to 1973, we were able to collapse these scores over time without risking artifacts arising from the attenuated nature of the PsycLIT data base. The OUTSIDERs had an average of 15.4 publications at the time of their appointment to TCP's editorial board in comparison to the MOMM's mean of 12.1

(SDs = 11.4 and 7.1, respectively); the *t* of .707 with 17*df*, however, was not significant. Nevertheless, the direction of the differences was opposite that predicted by the professional-Darwinism hypothesis.

A new TCP editor was appointed in 1990; six MOMMs and four OUTSIDERs were added in the first two years of his term. The effect of these appointments was to shrink slightly the disparity between the overall means accruing since 1985. The MOMMs now averaged 12.8 publications, the OUTSIDERs 14.4 (SDs respectively 8.5 and 10.6); and the *t* of .45 with 27*df* was still not significant.

Appointees to the editorial board of TCP were often less well published than their JCP counterparts. Ten of the foregoing 29 additions to the TCP board, for example, did not meet our cutoff of nine publications used to identify relatively unpublished JCP appointees. Indeed, individuals with as few as one or two publications have served on TCP's board. Unlike with the JCP data, however, we could not discern any differential disposition to appoint lowly published MOMMs.

STUDY II

The CCPTP list of 64 institutions does not include APIC sites, academic programs not pursuing accreditation, related departments, and so forth. Therefore, one might argue that a baseline of one MOMM for every 16 OUTSIDER institutions provides a very conservative foundation for comparison. Krumboltz (1990),

on the other hand, has suggested that more appropriate baselines may exist. For instance, depending upon the various pedigree-percentages contained on Division 17's membership roster, MOMMs might actually be under-represented.

Krumboltz's observation raises a thorny evaluation task. Over the past two decades there has been an exponential increase in the number of accredited OUTSIDER counseling psychology programs. For example, there were 21 accredited programs including the MOMMs in 1973, and 55 in 1989. We presumed that this phenomenon would result in steadily declining percentages of Division 17 MOMM memberships in recent years. To use current membership data on which to judge the representativeness of appointments made in previous eras would yield invidious conclusions. Our solution was to investigate two points in time, 1989 and 1973, the latter being the year before the PsycLIT data base began when the growth curve for accredited counseling psychology programs was still relatively flat.

Method

Subjects

The total populations (members and fellows) of Division 17 were 1,959 in 1973 and 2,571 in 1989. Random samples of 300 were drawn representing each year from lists published in the APA annual membership directory for those years.

Measure/Procedures

The classification of each of the 600 subjects as MOMM or

OUTSIDER was made on the basis of biographical data contained in the APA directory for the appropriate year by pairs of doctoral students working independently. Judgment discrepancies (<2% of the cases) were resolved by further inspection of the biographical entries. Essentially perfect reliability was achieved.

Results

OUTSIDERs comprised 85% of Division 17's membership in 1973 and 76% in 1989. This conspicuous decline in the percentage of OUTSIDERs comprising Division 17's membership stands in sharp contrast to the overall growth in Division 17's membership and the exponential increase in accredited OUTSIDER counseling psychology programs.

Regardless of whether one chooses the 1973 or 1989 baseline, however, the charges of non-representativeness leveled by Horan (1989) and Goldman (1990) hold firm. MOMM predominance in Division 17's governing structures typically ranges from one hundred to several hundred percent over what might be expected under conditions of equal access to professional ascendancy.

General Discussion

The drop in OUTSIDER percentage over the 1973-1989 period is contrary to our assumption that the growth of accredited OUTSIDER programs would be accompanied by an increase in the percentage of OUTSIDER memberships in Division 17. We view this decline in as an ominous indicator of Division 17's organizational health, and

believe it is due to the fact that many OUTSIDERs correctly perceive their opportunities for participation and leadership as relatively limited.

Although recent actions by the Fellowship Committee, if sustained, may remedy some of the inequities identified by Horan and Erickson (1991), the problem in other areas seems to be getting worse. For example, 34 MOMMs and 18 OUTSIDERs have been added to the editorial board of JCP since 1982, and no OUTSIDERs have been appointed in 3 of the last 5 years. The 54% MOMM predominance on JCP's editorial board cited by Horan (1989) and Goldman (1990) will soon bloat to 65% and beyond if this trend continues.

We frankly would not be concerned about MOMM predominance if the presumption of professional Darwinism was supported. But in fact it has been soundly refuted again. Relatively few OUTSIDERs manage to break through Division 17's glass ceiling. Those that do typically must display greater scholarly productivity than their MOMM counterparts. For want of a different pedigree many of our best and brightest members drift about in a sea of anonymity. Unless appropriate changes occur in the governance structures of Division 17, the inevitable loss of their membership may ultimately prove lethal for our science and our profession.

References

Goldman, L. (1990). Division 17 Presidential Address. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, August.

Horan, J. J. (1989). On professional preservation: New paint or new wood? Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, August.

Horan, J. J., & Erickson, C. D. (1991). Fellowship behavior in Division 17 and the MOMM Cartel. The Counseling Psychologist, 19, 253-259.

Krumboltz, J. D. (1990, August 20). Unpublished letter to Professor Leo Goldman, carboned to John J. Horan, Naomi Meara, and Lyle Schmidt.

Table 1

Descriptive information on scholarly productivity (PsycLIT counts) of Journal of Counseling Psychology editorial board members at the time of their appointment as a function of MOMM and OUTSIDER membership

Volume	New MOMMs	New OUTSIDERs
29 (1982)	N = 15	N = 9
	M = 12.6	M = 20.0
	SD = 10.3	SD = 7.9
30 (1983)	N = 2	N = 2
	M = 9.5	M = 17
	Raw Scores = 9, 10	Raw Scores = 10, 24
31 (1984)	N = 1	N = 0
	Raw Score = 5	---
32 (1985)	N = 0	N = 2
	---	M = 11.5
	---	Raw Scores = 9, 14

33 (1986)	N = 3	N = 1
	M = 8.33	---
	Raw Scores = 4, 4, 17	Raw Score = 17
34 (1987)	N = 1	N = 0
	Raw Score = 39	---
35 (1988)	N = 8	N = 3
	M = 18	M = 15
	Range = 12-31	Raw Scores = 10,17,18
36 (1989)	N = 0	N = 0
37 (1990)	N = 1	N = 1
	Raw Score = 14	Raw Score = 24
38 (1991)	N = 3	N = 0
	M = 20.3	---
	Raw Scores = 4, 16, 41	---

Note: MOMMs are graduates and/or employees of Minnesota, Ohio State, Maryland and Missouri; OUTSIDERs are affiliated with any other institution.